

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 13-16, and 18-28 were previously pending in the application. Claims 14 and 28 are canceled, claims 13 and 15 are amended, and new claims 29-31 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-6, 13, 15-16, 18-27, and 29-31 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 4 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 13-16, 18, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bossemeyer. In paragraph 5, the Examiner allowed claims 1-6 and 19-27. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the now-pending claims are allowable over Bossemeyer.

Claim 13

Claim 13 has been amended to recite that the access system does not have a dedicated port for the packet-mode CPE unit. Support for this amendment is found in claim 14 and on page 13, lines 15-27. Access system 205 of Fig. 2 is an exemplary embodiment of the access system of claim 13, where DSL CPE 131 is an example of the packet-mode CPE unit recited in claim 13. Thus, according to claim 13, access system 205 does not have a dedicated port for packet-mode DSL CPE unit 131.

As explained in the specification on page 13, lines 15-27, unlike the prior art, access system 205 does not have dedicated ports for derived voice users, such as telephone 133, which communicates with access system 205 via packet-mode DSL CPE 131. Instead, DLC system 205 dynamically assigns system resources, such as ports, for derived voice signals. Thus, a plurality of remote terminals, including DSLAMs, may be served from a single DLC/DSLAM. The incoming signals are evaluated to determine whether they correspond to data or voice. Then, resources are allocated based on this real-time determination. Furthermore, since packetized voice signals are converted to circuit-based voice signals and then switched by a circuit-switched network in a conventional manner, the voice quality is maintained.

The resources on the controller as well as on the circuit interface are not pre-assigned to particular remote derived voice sources. Instead, the resources may be shared by a plurality of incoming derived voice signals. Generally, system resources are assigned for either the duration of the call or the duration of the transfer. After the call (or transfer) is over, the system resources are freed and made available for the next call (or transfer).

In rejecting claim 14, the Examiner stated that "Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. disclose wherein the access system does not have individual dedicated resources for the packet-mode CPE unit," citing column 5, line 57, to column 6, line 5, and column 6, lines 51-54. The Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the Examiner mischaracterized these teachings in Bossemeyer. In particular, nowhere in these teachings does Bossemeyer teach or even suggest that an access system does not have individual dedicated resources, such as ports, for packet-mode CPE units.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 13 is allowable over Bossemeyer. Since claims 15-16 and 18 depend from claim 13, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Bossemeyer.

New Claim 29

Support for new claim 29 is found in previously pending claim 15 and page 13, lines 15-27. According to new claim 29, the access system dynamically allocates a port for the packet-mode CPE unit.

In rejecting claim 15, the Examiner stated that "Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. disclose wherein the access system dynamically allocates, in real time, system resources for the packet-mode CPE unit," citing column 20, lines 9-18. As in the previous section, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner mischaracterized these teachings in Bossemeyer. In particular, nowhere in these teachings does Bossemeyer teach or even suggest that an access system dynamically allocates system resources, such as ports, for packet-mode CPE units.


For these reasons as well as reasons presented in the previous section, the Applicant submits that new claim 29 is allowable over Bossemeyer. Since claims 30-31, support for which are found in previously pending claims 16 and 18, depend from claim 29, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Bossemeyer.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that the rejections of claims under Section 102(e) have been overcome.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/30/04
Customer No. 22186
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1515 Market Street, Suite 715
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102


Steve Mendelsohn
Registration No. 35,951
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-6657 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)